



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                        | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/989,372                             | 11/21/2001  | Richard H. Lane      | M4065.0338/P338-A   | 1348             |
| 24998                                  | 7590        | 07/26/2005           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP |             |                      | DOAN, THERESA T     |                  |
| 2101 L Street, NW                      |             |                      |                     |                  |
| Washington, DC 20037                   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 2814                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/989,372

Applicant(s)

LANE, RICHARD H.

Examiner

Theresa T. Doan

Art Unit

2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-32, 34-39, 41, 44-47, 49 and 51-64 is/are pending in the application:
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-32, 34-39, 41, 44-47, 49 and 51-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 29-32, 34-35, 55-58 and 60-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Xing et al. (U.S. 6,090,697) as previously cited.

Regarding claims 29-32 and 34-35, Xing et al. teach in figure 3 a semiconductor device comprising:

- a semiconductor substrate 300;
- an insulating layer 316 provided over the substrate; and
- a platinum metal layer 304 provided within an opening of the insulating layer to form a lower capacitor electrode, wherein the metal layer having a thickness of approximately 100-500 angstroms and wherein a top surface of the metal layer 304 is down to the insulating layer so that the top surface of the metal layer 304 is at the same level with a top surface of the insulating layer 316 (see figure 3).

As to the grounds of rejection under section 103(a), the methods for forming patterned metal layer by electro-polished and forming a contact hole by depositing "a photo-resist plug" are an intermediate process steps that do not affect the structure of

the final device. Additional, "a photoresist plug" will be removed after works therefore, **"a photoresist plug" is not included in the final structure.** See MPEP 2113 which discussed the handling of "product by process" claims and recommends the alternative (102/103) grounds of rejection. Therefore, the process limitations (forming an electro-polished patterned metal layer and a photoresist plug) would not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to a structure, because distinct structure is not necessarily produced. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Regarding claims 55-58, Xing (figures 3 and 5) discloses a container capacitor comprising:

a platinum lower electrode 304 provided within a first insulating layer 316, the platinum lower electrode 304 comprising a metal layer having a bottom wall and vertical sidewalls extending rectangular upwardly (see figure 5), wherein the platinum metal layer has a thickness of approximately 100-500 angstroms (figure 3, column 6, lines 13-17); a second insulating layer 312 provided over the metal layer and in contact with the first insulating layer 316; and an upper electrode 314 provided over the second insulating layer 312.

As to the grounds of rejection under section 103(a), the method for forming an electro-polished patterned metal layer is an intermediate process steps that does not affect the structure of the final device. See MPEP 2113 which discussed the handling of "product by process" claims and recommends the alternative (102/103) grounds of rejection. Therefore, the process limitation (forming an electro-polished patterned metal

Art Unit: 2814

layer) would not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to a structure, because distinct structure is not necessarily produced. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Regarding claims 60-64, Xing (figures 3 and 5) discloses a container capacitor comprising: an insulating layer 316 provided over a substrate 300; a plurality of rectangular (see figure 5) opening provided in the insulating layer; and a plurality of platinum lower capacitor electrodes provided along the bottom and sidewalls of respective ones of the rectangular openings, the platinum lower electrodes being formed as discrete metal layers, wherein the platinum electrodes 304 have a thickness of approximately 100-500 angstroms (figure 3, column 6, lines 13-17); and a dielectric layer 312 associated with each of the discrete the platinum lower electrodes, the dielectric layer being in contact with the first insulating layer 316.

As to the grounds of rejection under section 103(a), the method for forming an electro-polished patterned metal layer is an intermediate process steps that does not affect the structure of the final device. See MPEP 2113 which discussed the handling of "product by process" claims and recommends the alternative (102/103) grounds of rejection. Therefore, the process limitation (forming an electro-polished patterned metal layer) would not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to a structure, because distinct structure is not necessarily produced. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Art Unit: 2814

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 36-39, 41, 44-47, 49, 51-54 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xing et al. (U.S. 6,090,697) as previously cited in view of Huang (U.S. Pat. 6,127,260).

Regarding claims 36-39 and 41, Xing et al. teach in figures 3 and 6a, a memory cell comprising:

a transistor (not shown) including a gate fabricated on the semiconductor substrate and including a source/drain region in the semiconductor substrate disposed adjacent to the gate (figure 6a);

a platinum metal layer 304 within an insulating layer 316 provided over the substrate wherein a thickness of approximately 100-500 angstroms (figure 3, column 6, lines 13-17); and

a container capacitor including a lower electrode 304, a dielectric layer 312 over the lower electrode, and an upper electrode 314 over the dielectric layer, the lower electrode having a surface aligned over the source/drain region, the platinum metal layer forming the platinum lower electrode, and the dielectric layer 312 being in contact with the insulating layer 316. It is note that the process limitation (forming an electro-polished patterned metal layer) would not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to

Art Unit: 2814

a structure, because distinct structure is not necessarily produced. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Xing does not teach an upper electrode comprising doped polysilicon. However, Huang (figure 4) discloses an upper electrode 35 comprising doped polysilicon (column 5, lines 51-59). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to form dope polysilicon for an upper electrode of Xing because such the doped polysilicon of the upper electrode is conventional material used for storage node contacts structure, as taught by Huang.

Regarding claims 44-47 and 49, Xing et al. teach in figure 3 a processor-based system comprising:

a processor (column 13, lines 14-22); and

an integrated circuit coupled to the processor, at least one of the integrated circuit and processor comprising a container capacitor provided within an insulating layer 316, the container capacitor including a platinum lower electrode 304 having a thickness of approximately 50-300 angstroms (figure 3, column 6, lines 13-17), wherein a top surface of the metal layer 304 is at the same level with a top surface of the insulating layer 316.

As to the grounds of rejection under section 103(a), the method for forming an electro-polished patterned metal layer is an intermediate process steps that does not affect the structure of the final device. See MPEP 2113 which discussed the handling of "product by process" claims and recommends the alternative (102/103) grounds of

Art Unit: 2814

rejection. Therefore, the process limitation (forming an electro-polished patterned metal layer) would not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to a structure, because distinct structure is not necessarily produced. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Xing does not teach an upper electrode comprising doped polysilicon. However, Huang (figure 4) discloses an upper electrode 35 comprising doped polysilicon (column 5, lines 51-59). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to form dope polysilicon for an upper electrode of Xing because such the doped polysilicon of the upper electrode is conventional material used for storage node contacts structure, as taught by Huang.

Regarding claims 51-54, Xing et al. further teach the integrated circuit may be used in DRAMs, FRAMs and other types of integrated circuits (column 3, lines 28-30).

Regarding claim 59, as discussed above, Xing (figures 2-3) further discloses a container capacitor comprising: a tantalum nitride barrier conductive layer 310 (column 5, lines 2-4).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant argues that “the limitation **electropolished patterned** is simply not a product-by-process limitation, but rather a *resulting structure* having distinct and defined characteristics”. The argument is not persuasive because it should be noted that claims



29, 36, 44, 55 and 59-60 are not directed to any method for making a semiconductor device, but rather, are directed to the resulting of a semiconductor device. Therefore, the process limitation recited in claims 29, 36, 44, 55 and 59-60 (forming an electro-polished patterned metal layer) would not carry patentable weight in claims drawn to a structure because these claims are directed to the product, no matter how the product of these claims is actually made, and the patentability of the final product must be determined, not the patentability of the process, which in any case have not been presented in "product by process" claims. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Applicant's argument thus is not persuasive because the final structure of the metal formed by electropolished process as claimed does not distinguish from the final structure of the metal layer of Xing.

Also, Applicant argues that the patterned metal layer formed by "electropolished" process has resulting structure distinct from the resulting structure of the pattern metal layer 304 of Xing. However, Applicant fails to point out which claimed resulting structure is distinct from the resulting structure of the patterned metal layer 304 of Xing.

6. Applicant argues that Xing fails to disclose "an electropolished patterned metal layer provided within an opening of the insulating layer" and "a photoresist plug provided within the opening and over and in contact with the electropolished patterned metal layer" as amended independent claim 29 recites. The argument is not persuasive because the methods for forming patterned metal layer by electro-polished and forming a contact hole by depositing "a photo-resist plug" are an intermediate process steps that

Art Unit: 2814

do not affect the structure of the final device. Additional, "a photo-resist plug" will be removed after works therefore, **"a photo-resist plug" may be subsequently removed, does not preclude claiming such structure.** Thus, the photoresist is not included in the final structure and the final structure as claimed of the invention does not distinguish from the final structure of Xing. Therefore, the process limitations (forming an electro-polished patterned metal layer and a photoresist plug) would not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to a structure, because distinct structure is not necessarily produced. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

7. Applicant argues that Xing is also silent about a container capacitor comprising "a tantalum nitride barrier conductive layer provide at a bottom of said opening" (claim 59). The argument is not persuasive because Xing (Fig. 3) discloses a container capacitor **comprising**: a tantalum nitride barrier conductive layer 310 provide at a bottom of said opening (column 5, lines 2-<sup>10</sup>~~4~~).

8. Applicant argues that Xing is further silent about "a lower electrode . . . comprising an electropolished patterned metal layer having a bottom wall and vertical sidewalls extending rectangularly upwardly therefrom," as independent claim 55 recites. Applicant notes that it is the capacitor illustrated in Figure 3 of Xing that would arguably correspond to the capacitor of the claimed invention. The capacitor illustrated in Figure 5 of Xing does not correspond to the capacitor of the claimed invention.

This argument is not persuasive because applicant could not argue against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). It should be noted that the rejection of claim 55 is not based on anticipation, but rather, is based on obviousness. In this case, Examiner relies on the combined teachings of Fig. 3 and Fig. 5 of Xing. In Fig. 5 of Xing is not relied on for teaching of a container capacitor. In Fig. 3 of Xing teaches a container capacitor comprising: a lower electrode provided within a first insulating layer and an upper electrode. Fig. 5 of Xing is relied on only for teaching the known features of forming vertical sidewalls extending rectangularly upwardly therefrom. Examiner thus regards the Applicant's assertions as constituting evidence that the applicant has failed to consider **as a whole the prior art teachings** disclosed by the combining of the references.

9. Applicant argues that the combined references also fail to disclose, teach or suggest "a container capacitor including a lower electrode, a dielectric layer... and an upper electrode... comprising doped polysilicon" (claim 36). And also, Applicant notes that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Xing with those of Hung to arrive at the claim invention.

This argument is not persuasive because it does not require that the references must suggest the problem for combining them as asserted by Applicant. Therefore, the

Art Unit: 2814

combination of Xing and Huang would be proper because the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the doped polysilicon of the upper electrode is conventional material used for storage node contacts structure (as taught by Huang) would motivate one skilled in the art to combine the references as suggested.

The rest of applicant's arguments, addressed to the amended claims are considered in the rejections shown above.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2814


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theresa T. Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1704. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WAEL FAHMY can be reached on (571) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TD  
July 25, 2005.

  
PHAT X. CAO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER